

humanitarian workers have been detained for long periods of time and summarily deported from Mexico.

The deficient reception of humanitarian workers in Chiapas casts doubt on the sincerity of the Mexican Government when it says it wants to work with the United States and others to control drug trafficking or to enter into end-use monitoring agreements on the transfer of military equipment.

Mr. President, I believe the United States has an obligation to be an advocate for human rights protections around the world. I am not convinced that the Mexican National Commission on Human Rights (CNDH), which was established in 1990, has done enough to prevent continuing violations by Mexican law enforcement officials and the Mexican military. I believe the United States must make human rights a top priority in our relations with Mexico, and I do not believe Mexico can reach stability without permitting its citizens to exercise their basic rights. In light of the proximity of Mexico to the United States and the myriad ties between our two countries, we have a clear interest in working to ensure that human rights are respected in Mexico.

Again, Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S.Con.Res. 128, which, in my view, will further call attention to the on-going human rights abuses in Chiapas. I hope that the Administration will actively work to put human rights at the very top of our priority list with respect to Mexico, and that the Mexican government will take concrete steps to end the violence in Chiapas and to respect the rights of all Mexican citizens and international visitors.

BRIBERY IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to bring to the Senate's attention an excellent editorial published by the Washington Post on Wednesday, October 7, 1998 concerning the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions.

This convention seeks to establish worldwide standards for the criminalization of the bribery of foreign officials to influence or retain business. Just over 20 years ago the Congress passed the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, or FCPA. This landmark legislation, which I am proud to say was sponsored by one of Wisconsin's most respected elected officials, Senator William Proxmire, was enacted after it was discovered that some American companies were keeping slush funds for making questionable and/or illegal payments to foreign officials to help land business deals.

For these 20 years, the FCPA has succeeded at curbing U.S. corporate bribery of foreign officials by establishing extensive bookkeeping requirements to ensure transparency and by criminalizing the bribery of foreign officials.

The OECD treaty, which passed the Senate unanimously earlier this year, would bring most of our major trading partners up to the same standards that U.S. companies have been exercising since the FCPA became law.

Mr. President, I consider this treaty, and the implementing legislation, S. 2375, that accompanies it, to be important work of the Congress. However, as the Washington Post noted in its editorial, the House of Representatives has yet to pass this legislation.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which had the responsibility to recommend the Senate provide its advice and consent on this treaty, I hope the House will move quickly to pass the implementing legislation prior to adjournment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the October 7, 1998, Washington Post editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1998]

A VOTE AGAINST BRIBES

It's not every day that Congress has an opportunity to pass legislation that has no down side whatsoever, that can only help the United States and U.S. businesses; that fulfills a demand Congress itself made 10 years ago; and that—perhaps rarest of all—has the ardent support of both President Clinton and Sen. Jesse Helms. The House has such an opportunity now, with a bill to implement an international treaty combating bribery overseas. Yet, perhaps not surprisingly, even this universally acclaimed legislation is no longer a sure thing.

More than 20 years ago, Congress passed the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, which outlawed the paying of bribes by U.S. business executives to win foreign contracts. It was and remains a good law, and by most accounts it has had a beneficial effect on how Americans do business. But it's also put them at a competitive disadvantage to European and other companies that not only aren't prohibited from paying bribes but in many cases can deduct the payoffs from their taxes. The administration estimates that U.S. industry may lost \$30 billion worth of contracts each year for its honesty.

The Clinton administration last year negotiated a treaty with other major industrial countries that would essentially extend the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act to all of them. Instead of the United States lowering its standards, long years of diplomacy finally persuaded Europeans to raise theirs. The Senate unanimously ratified the treaty, citing what Sen. Helms called an "urgent need to push—and I use that word advisedly—to push our European allies" to criminalize bribery overseas. Now the House must make U.S. law consistent with the treaty. No one is against this. But the press of business may put the bill in danger.

This may seem less urgent than other matters awaiting congressional action. But corruption is at the root of the financial crisis sweeping the world. Rich countries are good at telling their poor counterparts to behave; here is a change to show that the rich are willing to police themselves, too. For the United States, which has been doing such policing for two decades, this is a no-lose proposition. But if Congress doesn't approve the treaty, Europe and Japan won't either. The House should pocket this win before it's too late.

MEDICAL DEVICE MANUFACTURER YEAR 2000 RESPONSE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, about two weeks ago, a list of medical device companies was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which indicated they were non-responsive to The Food and Drug Administration's request for Year 2000 compliance status.

As Chairman of the Senate Medical Technology Caucus, I believe it is important my colleagues have the latest on manufacturers which have been responsive to the FDA's request for information on the Year 2000 compliance status of their products. Companies were asked by the FDA to indicate in their response the following:

The medical devices marketed and have sold are not Year 2000 vulnerable; medical devices marketed and sold are all year 2000 compliant; the manufacturer is providing specific information regarding those products which are not compliant or their assessment is currently incomplete; or the manufacturer is working on an assessment and will post the results.

Mr. President, there are many sectors of our economy which still need to address the potential for problems in the year 2000, but I am pleased that a vast majority of medical device companies in the United States have responded to the FDA on year 2000 compliance status and deserve to be recognized for having done so.

I would like to mention specifically thirteen companies mistakenly listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as being unresponsive to the FDA's request. These manufacturers have responded to the FDA's request for Year 2000 compliance status: Apothecary Incorporated, Augustine Medical Incorporated, Braemar Corporation, Dantec Medical Incorporated, Diametrics Medical Incorporated, Keomed Incorporated, Medtronic PS Medical Medtronic Biomedicus, Medtronic Neurological, Prime Ideas Incorporated, Puritan Bennett Corporation, Timm Research Company, and Williams Sound Corporation.

Mr. President, while this list only represents companies based in Minnesota, the FDA has compiled a much larger listing of companies which are or have addressed year 2000 issues on their website located at www.fda.gov.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the 105th Congress is nearing its conclusion. As we look over the past two years of this Congress, one issue that consumed hours of effort and debate, exposed problems that strike at the heart of our government, and whose ramifications are nothing less than a cancer eating at the body politic, remains unresolved. I'm talking about campaign finance reform.

In January 1997, this Congress launched multiple investigations into events associated with the 1996 federal elections. Dozens of hearings were held,